

Pepperdine University Pepperdine Digital Commons

School of Public Policy Working Papers

School of Public Policy

1-1-2011

Immigration Regulation

Luisa Blanco

Pepperdine University, luisa.blancoraynal@pepperdine.edu

Odinakachi Anyanwu

Pepperdine University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/sppworkingpapers>



Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Legal Studies Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blanco, Luisa and Anyanwu, Odinakachi, "Immigration Regulation" (2011). Pepperdine University, *School of Public Policy Working Papers*. Paper 34.

<http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/sppworkingpapers/34>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Public Policy at Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Public Policy Working Papers by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact Kevin.Miller3@pepperdine.edu.

Immigration Regulation

Luisa Blanco - Pepperdine University and RAND (lblanco@pepperdine.edu)

Odinakachi Anyanwu – Pepperdine University (ojanyanw@pepperdine.edu)

Forthcoming in *Encyclopedia of Race and Racism*, 2nd Edition

Introduction

Immigration regulation is defined here as any policy that has the objective of encouraging or discouraging immigration. There are two major categories of immigration regulation: those policies that directly affect the inflow of immigrants and those that influence the everyday lives of immigrants and processes related to the acquisition of legal permanent residency or citizenship. Immigration regulation is quite diverse across time and space; immigration policy is fluid and dynamic and is affected by socioeconomic, cultural, and political factors. Thus, immigration regulation evolves in response to current conditions in a specific country. The role of race in immigration regulation also has an evolving character.

This article will briefly discuss immigration regulation comparatively across countries with an emphasis on policies that seek to manage the inflow of immigrants. The more in depth discussion of the role of race in immigration regulation and the impact of immigration regulation on the racial composition of a receiving country will be devoted to the United States experience.

I. Immigration regulation across time and across countries

With respect to immigration regulation across time, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a relatively liberal approach toward immigration prevailed around the world and migration flourished between 1870 and 1930 (Lynch and Simon 2003, Spickard 2007). While there were some specific policies that restricted the immigration of certain groups (for example the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, see Table 1), during these years countries exercised little control over immigration inflows.

This lax regulation of immigration was a consequence of the economic conditions of the time, with labor shortages in several countries. With the second industrial revolution that started in the late nineteenth century, Zolberg (1978) states that there were significant migration flows to those countries that experienced fast industrial development. In the case of the United States, which experienced labor shortages at the time, the percentage of the foreign born population increased from twelve to fourteen percent between 1880 and 1900, as noted in Table 2. Table 2 also shows that the main source of migration during that period of time was Europe, where 86 percent of the foreign born population came from that region. Restrictive and selective immigration policies began during the 1920s. In the case of European countries, it is argued by William McNeill and Ruth Adams (1978) that World War I brought concerns about national security, which led countries into implementing more restrictive immigration policies. In the case of the United States, it has been argued by Desmond King (2000) and Paul Spickard (2007) that race played a key role shaping immigration policies during the 1920s, and these policies continued until the 1950s and 1960s.

In order to differentiate immigration regulation across time and space, Thomas Bauer et al. (2000) use a broad classification scheme for the main immigrant receiving countries. They identify countries as traditional immigration countries, post-colonial immigration or active recruitment countries, and new immigrant countries. The traditional immigration countries, including Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, had explicit immigration policies that promoted immigrant inflows in the early twentieth century. These countries promoted permanent settlement because they saw immigration as a key factor for economic development.

However, their approach toward immigration was not applied universally. The traditional immigration countries encouraged emigration from preferred source countries. Subsequently, selectivity in immigration regulation in these countries has changed from a primary focus on country of origin to the economic characteristics of the individual migrants.

The second group of countries, the post-colonial immigration countries, are those who experienced population inflows in the aftermath of World War II era, including Austria, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. These countries had a significant inflow of immigrants either as a result of active recruitment in order to reconstruct after World War II or as a result of the repercussions of decolonization.

Those countries dealing with labor shortages during the 1950s and 1960s implemented guest worker programs to encourage immigration. The United Kingdom, which had an open migration policy towards citizens of the Commonwealth states, also experienced a large inflow of immigrants in the post World War II era. With the global

economic downturn of the 1970s and 1980s, these countries moved towards more restrictive immigration policies.

The new immigration countries are countries that started seeing an increase in migration in the 1980s, and these countries are Italy, Ireland and Spain. These countries had to develop their immigration system since they were inexperienced in dealing with the new inflows of people.

James Lynch and Rita Simon (2003) provide a comparison of immigration regulation between countries that are the main receivers of immigrants. They compare contemporary immigration regulation across the United States, Canada, Australia, Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan. An immigrant nation, according to Lynch and Simon (2003, p.209), is a “country that accepts, even encourages, immigration to the point where immigrants figure prominently in the population, the culture and the mythology of that nation.” According to this definition, an immigrant nation would have fewer preconditions for admission, will display an inflow of immigrants that will be a large share of the country’s population, and will have a less stringent process towards acquiring citizenship through naturalization. In their analysis, only Australia, Canada and the United states classify as immigrant nations. Germany and Japan are classified as nonimmigrant nations because of their restrictive immigration policies. France and Great Britain show characteristics of both immigrant and nonimmigrant nations. Sweden, though not mentioned as an “immigrant nation” by Lynch and Simon, also has a large immigrant population. Per-Ander Edin et al. (2000, p.165) find that “Sweden has also experienced a substantial increase in its immigrant population.” They also mention that in

1997 the percentage of immigrant population in Sweden, at 11 percent, was higher than the percentage of immigrant population in the United States at the time.

While Lynch and Simon (2003) classify countries as immigrant and nonimmigrant nations, they also see significant variation among countries they place in the same category. While Canada uses an elaborate point system that provides advantages to individuals with certain skills, the United States has no point system. In the United States, preference is based on a quota system, where individual characteristics (language proficiency, age, etc.) are not relevant for selection. In the quota system of the United States, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section, a quota was determined as a percentage of the number of immigrants from respective countries of origin at the time of a designated national census. Australia uses a point system, but its approach is more relaxed than the one taken in Canada. In addition, Australia and Canada have the highest rates of naturalization. Lynch and Simon (2003, p.101) highlight that in Australia naturalization requirements are minimal resulting in high rates of naturalization, where it is observed that “after five years of residence, more than half of those born overseas had become Australian citizens; after twenty years, 70 percent had been granted citizenship.” Lynch and Simon (2003) also note that Canada similarly has a high naturalization rate in comparison with other nations, with its three-year waiting period for citizenship, almost all eligible immigrants residing Canada have become citizens.

There is also diversity among immigrant and nonimmigrant nations in relation to policies towards assimilation. According to Lynch and Simon (2003), while the United States, Great Britain and Japan have no formal policies in place to help immigrants adjust to the new society, Australia and Germany have specific policies helping individuals to

assimilate. In the case of the United States, which is the focus of the paper, it is important to note that recently there has been more emphasis on the designing of programs to help immigrants to assimilate. In fact, a Task Force on New Americans was created in 2006 to determine ways in which immigrants can be assisted in the process of assimilation.

WelcometoUSA.gov, which provides relevant information for new immigrants and was launched in 2007, is an example of recent efforts by the American government to assist immigrants. Furthermore, the United States and France show a much larger flow of illegal immigration than any of the other countries because of their geographic location, where illegal immigration is not common among Japan, England and Australia.

While the typologies of immigration regulation discussed above are helpful in understanding immigration policy across time and space, there are some limitations associated with this approach. First, these broad classifications are not comprehensive and several countries are not considered. Second, because immigration regulation is dynamic in nature, a typology that groups countries together should also be changing over time. Thus, it is likely that the different categories and the countries composing these categories will change. Finally, when establishing different types of immigration regulation across countries, some subjectivity is involved. There is not a rule that clearly allows researchers to separate countries in terms of immigration policy, and there is significant room for different interpretations of how immigration regulation works in each country.

It is important to note that the typologies discussed have another significant limitation: they focus on migration inflows to developed countries (DCs) and do not provide a discussion of migration inflows to less developed countries (LDCs). There is

evidence of significant migration from DCs to LDCs (e.g. immigration from Japan to Brazil) and from LDCs to LDCs (e.g. immigration from Nigeria to South Africa). Oliver Bakewell (2009) provides some data on origin and destination of immigrants by LDCs (i.e. South) and DCs (i.e. North) around 2000, and this data shows the following trends. While migration from LDCs to DCs is around thirty seven percent of total migration, migration from DCs to LDCs represents only around four percent. DCs-DCs migration is only four percent of total flows, but LDCs-LDCs migration represents forty five percent of migration. Economic conditions will play a key role shaping immigration policy in LDCs. Oliver Bakewell states (2009) that while governments in LDCs usually fail to control immigration flows, they put in place aggressive policies of expulsion. Based on the literature, immigration policy in LDCs seems to be centered not only on issues related to expulsion, but also emigration of skilled workers (i.e. brain drain) and remittances.

In the past, we observed that countries shaped immigration policy with the purpose to encourage immigration from specific source countries that meet certain racial characteristics. This approach towards immigration was observed in the early 1900s in immigrant nations such as the United States and Australia (Joppke 2005, Lynch and Simon 2003, King 2000, Spickard 2009), but also in countries such as Argentina and Brazil (Graham et al. 1990). As argued by Christian Joppke (2005), immigration policy in most Western countries is no longer influenced by race, and the main factors considered today for immigrant selection are skills, family ties and human need.

In sum, from this brief overview of immigration policy across time and across countries, it is obvious that immigration regulation tends to fluctuate significantly over time and is highly diverse across countries. It is also evident that the economic, social and

political conditions of a country have a large influence shaping immigration policy.

Reviewing the evolution of immigration regulation in the United States since the 1900s will provide a better understanding of how these forces shape immigration policy.

II. Immigration regulation and race in the United States

The United States is considered an immigrant nation because it has embraced immigration and has been built by immigrants. However, the process of shaping immigration regulation in the United States has been a process of give and take. Discussing major legislation related to immigration policy in the United States provides evidence of the evolving nature of immigration regulation.

Regarding slavery and the role it played when shaping migration policy, Spickard (2007) considers the enslavement of Africans as a founding fact of American history and culture. Though Africans forcibly brought into the United States in the 1800s qualify as immigrants by definition, and the slave trade indeed marks the beginning of American immigration, historical discussion of immigration policy during that period excludes African slaves and their descendants as a concern (King 2000). Furthermore, Desmond King (2000) points out that debates surrounding immigration in the 1920s excluded involuntary immigrants and their descendants and focused primarily on varying categories of European immigrants. More explicitly, the 1924 Immigration Act “excluded the descendants of slave immigrants from entitlement to immigration and excised them from the population of the United States on which quotas were to be based” (King 2000, p.158).

Table 1 presents a summary of the main legislation and its main consequences related to immigration regulation in the United States. A liberal approach towards immigration was taken in the late 1800s and early 1900s, but a movement towards a restrictive immigration policy based on race was evident with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. According to Andrew Gyory (1998), the Chinese Exclusion Act set the precedent for future restrictive policies that displayed a preference for immigrants with certain racial characteristics. King (2000) argues that because of the conception of American national identity was focused on the English inheritance, preference was given to white individuals with Anglo-Saxon roots.

In the first two decades of the 1900s, a debate over who were desirable and undesirable immigrants developed. Concerns centered on assimilability. King (2000) argues that race, mental competence, and criminality were the criteria for determining who were undesirable immigrants during the early 1900s.

The Dillingham Commission, established with the Immigration Act of 1907, had as its main purpose the completion of a report on the assimilability of American immigrants. The report issued in 1911 stated that old immigrants (people from northern and western Europe) were more likely to assimilate into American culture than new immigrants (people from southern and eastern Europe). The Commission recommended restricting immigration based on potential for assimilation, and its recommendation had a significant influence on legislation designed to control immigration in the 1910s and 1920s.

The Immigration Act of 1917 led to further restrictions on immigration by requiring a literacy test and by specifying an Asian zone that was banned from

immigration. Concerns about the assimilability of immigrants led to the implementation of a quota system biased toward allowing more immigrants from Northern and Western Europe in the 1920s. The Emergency Quota Act of 1921 established an annual limit to total immigration at no more than three percent of the national population according to the census of 1910. The quota system permitted more immigrants from countries that already had significant presence in the United States.

The Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 proposed further restrictions on immigration that were biased towards restricting entrance of ostensibly undesirable immigrants. This act set a 2 percent quota based on the 1890 census to begin in 1927, but it was postponed until 1929. In 1929 a new quota system based on national origins according to the 1920 census was implemented; 83 percent of the quota went to Northern and Western Europeans, 15 percent to Southern and Eastern Europeans, and 2 percent to other areas. According to King (2000), under this national origins system, people from the United Kingdom, Ireland and Germany represented 70 percent of the allocated places for immigrants in 1965.

King (2000) argues that immigration policies in the United States between the 1900s and 1920s were focused on promoting an Anglo-Saxon dominant ethnic identity, and immigration regulation played a significant role in building the “real American stock.” The process of building an American identity that was centered on the construction of an Anglo-Saxon identity led to significant anti-immigrant sentiments in the 1920s. Furthermore, Paul Spickard (2007) argues that between 1920s and 1950, the pseudoscience of eugenics had an influence on the immigration debate. Eugenics was

focused on selective breeding to improve the human race, and provided some basis for separating desirable from undesirable immigrants.

Because the socioeconomic and political environment shapes immigration policy, immigration regulation changed significantly with the emergence of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 abolished the national origins system that was biased toward white immigration. This new system allowed a total of 290,000 immigrants per year, allocating 170,000 places for immigrants from the Eastern hemisphere (with a maximum of 20,000 immigrants per country) and 120,000 places for immigrants from the Western hemisphere. While this new quota system tried to eliminate inequities in the selection of immigrants, King (2000) observes it was criticized because it still favored highly skilled immigrants and ethnic groups already present in the United States due to the importance given to family reunion in the preference system. Nonetheless, the source countries for immigrants significantly changed with this new legislation, and there has been a significant increase in the inflow of immigrants from Asia and Latin America.

Statistics related to the region of origin of the foreign born population in the United States show that immigration regulation has a significant effect on the racial composition of the country. Table 2 presents the percentage of the foreign born population in the United States by region of origin between 1880 and 2009, and these statistics show the impact of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 on the composition of the foreign born population. In the early 1900s, the percentage of the foreign born population that was from Europe was around 80 percent. The percentage of the foreign born that came from Europe decreased in 1970 and 1980, while the

percentage of the foreign born that came from Latin America and Asia increased significantly during these years. In fact, according to 2009 data on the foreign born population, those coming from Europe represent only 13 percent of the total foreign born population, while those coming from Latin America and Asia represent 53 and 28 percent, respectively.

Statistics on legal immigration in relation to country and region of last residency also show how immigration policy has a significant effect on immigration flows. Table 3 shows the total number of immigrants between 1901 and 2001 by country of last residency for those countries that represent a large percentage of the total flow of immigrants. Table 3 shows that the total number of immigrants coming from European countries, such as Germany and Ireland, decreased significantly between 1961 and 1970. During that same period, there was a significant increase in the number of immigrants from China.

Furthermore, data on the number of persons who obtained legal permanent residency by region of last residency also reveals significant changes during the 1960s (Table 4). Between 1950 and 1959, 56 percent of those receiving legal permanent residency came from Europe, while only 5 and 37 percent came from Asia and the Americas, respectively. These statistics contrast significantly with those for the interval between 2000 and 2009 when only 13 percent of those obtaining residency came from Europe, and 43 and 34 percent came from Asia and the Americas, respectively. Furthermore, Tables 3 and 4 show that there has been a significant increase in immigration from Africa since the 1970s as well.

Changes in the racial composition of the United States seem to be related, at least in part, to changes in immigration regulation. Table 5 presents the population by race and Hispanic origins in the United States between 1890 and 2010. The percentage of the population of white non-Hispanic origin, which remained around 90 and 80 percent until the 1980s and decreased to 64 percent in 2010. On the other hand, the percentage of the population of Asian origin increased from 1 percent in 1970 to 5 percent in 2010. Additionally, Hispanics represented only 6 percent of the total population in 1980, but they became the largest minority group by 2010, representing 16 percent of the total population in 2010.

The discussion of immigration regulation and its development overtime also extends itself to asylees and refugees. Lynch and Simon (2003, p.14) highlight the fact that refugees are defined as persons outside their homeland who are unable or unwilling to return because of persecution or fear of persecution. Immigration policy in the United States, rooted in the Immigration Nationality Act of 1952, and the later 1980 Refugee Act, the 1986 Immigration Reform Control Act, and the 1990 Immigration Act, also define refugees similarly. Persons seeking refugee status in the United States must showcase “a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion” (Gabor and Rosenquest 2006, p.279). The definition of an asylee, though sharing similar requisite criteria, is different from a refugee because of the immigrant’s location when they apply (Lynch and Simon 2003, p.17). Political asylum is intended to protect migrants who escape persecution in their countries of origin and seek humanitarian protection once they are physically in their host country.

The United States has seen surges in the refugee population and simultaneous changes in refugee policy based on changing political and economic conditions. The surge in refugees in the United States, and worldwide, after World War II resulted in the recognition of the “asylum seeker’s right to *nonrefoulement*, or of not being forcibly removed to unsafe conditions in one’s country of origin” (Salehyan and Rosenblum 2008, p.104). Such policies were also extended to refugees escaping communist countries and seeking a safe haven in the United States during the Cold War.

Elizabeth Harris (1993, p.271) argues that “economic refugees face the same possibility of death by governmental mass terror campaigns and starvation due to embargoes or other political tactics as political refugees do,” yet they are not granted the same legal protection in the United States. Harris (1993, p.270) also acknowledges, however, that it is difficult for economic refugees to “prove that they have been singled out for persecution” in the same manner that “political asylees must.” The discussion surrounding the delegitimization of economic persecution as a requisite for refugee status remains controversial.

Immigration policy evolves over time responding to socioeconomic, cultural and political conditions. While race played a significant role in the selection process of immigrants in the early twentieth century, countries have moved away from explicit racial considerations. Today, immigration policy is built in a way that promotes equality among nations in theory, and to a high degree in practice, as the data on immigration flows show. Selection criteria in most countries are related to certain skills that allow an individual to contribute economically and assimilate to the society or family reunion and asylum considerations. (Word count: 3736)

References

American Community Survey. 2009. Place of Birth of the Foreign-Born Population: 2009. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/foreign/reports.html>

Bauer, Thomas K., Magnus Lofstrom, and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2000. *Immigration policy, assimilation of immigrants and natives' sentiments towards immigrants: evidence from 12 OECD-countries*. Bonn: IZA.

Bakewell, Oliver. 2009. *South-south migration and human development reflections on African experiences*. [New York]: United Nations Development Programme.

Edin, Per-Anders, Robert John Lalonde, and Olaf Åslund. 2000. "Emigration Of Immigrants And Measures Of Immigrant Assimilation: Evidence From Sweden". Working Paper. (Uppsala University, Department Of Economics), 13.

Gabor, Francis, and John B. Rosenquest. 2006. "The Unsettled Status of Economic Refugees from the American and International Legal Perspectives-A Proposal For Recognition Under Existing International Law". *Texas International Law Journal*. 41 (2): 275-296.

Gibson, Campbell and Kay Jung. 2002. Historical Census Statistics on Population Totals By Race, 1790 to 1990, and By Hispanic Origin, 1970 to 1990, For The United States,

Regions, Divisions, and States. US Census Bureau. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056/twps0056.html>

Graham, Richard, Thomas E. Skidmore, Aline Helg, and Alan Knight. 1990. *The Idea of race in Latin America, 1870-1940*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Gyory, Andrew. 1998. *Closing the gate race, politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/2001272>.

Harris, Elizabeth K. 1993. "Economic Refugees: Unprotected In The United States By Virtue Of An Inaccurate Label". *American University Journal of International Law and Policy*. 9 (1): 269.

Homeland Security. 2010. Yearbook of Immigration Statistics 2010. Table 1, Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Resident Status: Fiscal Years 1820 to 2010. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from <http://www.dhs.gov/files/statistics/publications/LPR10.shtm>

Joppke, Christian. 2005. "Are "Nondiscriminatory" Immigration Policies Reversible?" *Comparative Political Studies*. 38 (1): 3-25.

King, Desmond S. 2000. *Making Americans: immigration, race, and the origins of the diverse democracy*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Lynch, James P., and Rita J. Simon. 2003. *Immigration the world over: statutes, policies, and practices*. Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers.

McNeill, William H., and Ruth Adams. 1978. *Human migration: patterns and policies*. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press.

Salehyan, Idean, and Marc R. Rosenblum 2008. "International Relations, Domestic Politics, and Asylum Admissions in the United States". *Political Research Quarterly*. 61 (1): 104-121.

Spickard, Paul R. 2007. *Almost all aliens: immigration, race, and colonialism in American history and identity*. New York: Routledge.

United States Census Bureau. 2000. Profile of the Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2000. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/foreign/reports.html>

United States Census Bureau. 2010. Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>

United States Census Bureau. 2011. The 2011 Statistical Abstract: Historical Statistics, Immigration by Leading Country or Region of Last Residence. Accessed on June 10, 2011. Available from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/hist_stats.html

Zolberg, Aristide. 1978. "International Migration Policies in a Changing World," in McNeill, William H., and Ruth Adams. *Human migration: patterns and policies*. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press.

Author's information

Luisa R. Blanco
Assistant Professor of Economics
School of Public Policy
Pepperdine University

Odinakachi J. Anyanwu
MPP Candidate 2012
School of Public Policy
Pepperdine University

Table 1. Immigration Legislation in the United States (selected legislation)

Legislation	Main consequences of legislation
Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882	Excludes Chinese immigrants (renewed several times, repealed in 1943)
Immigration Act of 1891	Designs an organized immigration process, focused on medical evaluations
Immigration Act of 1907	Establishes the Dillingham Commission and excluded people with mental or physical defects.
Immigration Act of 1917	Introduces the literacy test and set a Asiatic Barred Zone (excluding the Philippines and Japan)
Emergency Quota Act of 1921	Sets a new quota system, with a 3 percent per year of the foreign born population using the 1910 census.
Johnson-Reed Act of 1924	Proposes a more restrictive quota system to begin in 1927, setting a 2 percent per year using the 1890 census (postponed until 1929)
National Origins Quota System of 1929	Sets a new quota system based on the national origins of the distribution of the US population in 1920
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952	Reaffirms the national origins quota system and restricts immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere
Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965	Abolishes the national origins system and sets an annual ceiling for Eastern and Western Hemispheres
Immigration Control and Reform Act of 1986	Provides amnesty for 3 million of undocumented workers
Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996	Increases border control and penalties for those who employ undocumented workers, and sets deportation procedure

Source: King (2000) and Spickard (2007)

Table 2. Foreign Born Population by Region of Birth in the United States, 1880-2009 (selected years)

Year	Foreign Born	Europe	Latin America	Asia	Other	Total
	<i>% total pop</i>		<i>% of foreign born pop</i>			
1880	13	86			14	100
1900	14	86			14	100
1930	12	83	6		11	100
1960	5	75	9	5	11	100
1970	5	62	19	9	10	100
1980	6	39	33	19	9	100
1990	8	23	44	26	7	100
2000	10	15	51	26	8	100
2009	13	13	53	28	7	100

Source: US Census Bureau (2000) and the American Community Survey (2009)

Table 3. Immigration by Leading Country or Region of Last Residence in the United States: 1901 to 2000, by 10 year periods

	1901- 1910	1911-1920	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1970	1971-1980	1981-1990	1991-2000
All countries	8795	5736	4107	528	1035	2515	3322	4493	7338	9095
Germany	341	144	412	114	227	478	191	74	92	93
Ireland ^a	339	146	211	11	20	48	33	11	32	57
Italy	2046	1110	455	68	58	185	214	129	67	63
Norway	191	66	69	5	10	23	15	4	4	5
Sweden	250	95	97	4	11	22	17	7	11	13
Soviet Union	1597	921	62	1	1	1	2	39	58	463
United King.	526	341	340	32	139	203	214	137	159	152
China ^b	21	21	30	5	10	10	35	124	347	419
Canada & New.	179	742	925	109	172	378	413	170	157	192
Mexico ^c	50	219	459	61	61	300	454	640	1656	2249
Caribbean	108	123	75	50	50	123	470	741	872	979
Africa	7	8	6	2	7	14	29	81	177	355

In thousands

^a Prior to 1926, data for Northern Ireland included in Ireland.

^b Beginning in 1957, China includes Taiwan.

^c Land arrivals not completely enumerated until 1908.

Source: US Census Bureau (2011)

Table 4. Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Residency by Region and Selected Countries of Last Residency, 1890-2010, by 10 year periods

<i>In thousands</i>	1890- 1899	1900- 1909	1910- 1919	1920- 1929	1930- 1939	1940- 1949	1950- 1959	1960- 1969	1970- 1979	1980- 1989	1990- 1999	2000- 2009	2010
Total	3694	8202	6347	4296	699	857	2499	3214	4248	6244	9775	10299	1043
<i>Europe</i>	3576	7573	4985	2560	444	473	1405	1133	826	669	1349	1349	95
Germany	579	329	174	387	119	120	577	210	77	86	92	122	8
Ireland b	406	345	166	203	28	16	47	38	11	22	65	16	2
Italy	604	1930	1230	528	85	51	185	200	150	56	76	28	3
Russia	450	1501	1107	62	2	1	0	2	28	33	433	167	8
United Kingdom	329	470	372	342	62	132	196	220	133	154	156	172	15
<i>Asia</i>	61	300	270	127	19	35	136	359	1407	2391	2860	3471	410
China	15	20	21	31	6	16	9	14	18	171	342	592	68
India	0	3	3	2	1	2	2	19	148	232	353	590	66
<i>America</i>	37	278	1071	1591	230	328	922	1674	1904	2695	5138	4442	427
Canada & Newf.	3	123	709	949	163	161	353	433	179	156	195	236	19
Mexico	1	31	185	499	33	56	274	442	621	1010	2757	1704	139
Caribbean	31	101	121	83	18	46	116	427	709	790	1005	1054	139
Central America	1	7	16	17	7	20	40	99	120	339	610	591	44
South America	1	15	40	43	10	20	78	251	274	400	571	857	86
<i>Africa</i>	0	6	9	6	2	7	13	24	71	142	346	760	98
<i>% of total</i>													
Europe	97	92	79	60	64	55	56	35	19	11	14	13	9
Asia	2	4	4	3	3	4	5	11	33	38	29	34	39
America	1	3	17	37	33	38	37	52	45	43	53	43	41
Africa	0.01	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	1	1	1	2	2	4	7	9

Source: Homeland Security (2010). Please refer to original source for specifics on calculation of totals in specific years.

Table 5. Population By Race and Hispanic Origin in the United States, 1890-2010 (selected years)

Census year	Total population	White	%	Black	%	Ame. Indian ^a	%	Asian& Pac.Isl.	%	Other race	%	Hispanic origin ^b	%	White, nonhisp	%
1890	62,948	55,101	88	7,489	12	248	0.4	110	0.2						
1900	75,995	66,809	88	8,834	12	237	0.3	114	0.2						
1910	91,972	81,732	89	9,828	11	266	0.3	147	0.2						
1920	105,711	94,821	90	10,463	10	244	0.2	182	0.2						
1930	122,775	110,287	90	11,891	10	332	0.3	265	0.2						
1940	131,669	118,215	90	12,866	10	334	0.3	255	0.2			1,858	1	116,357	88
1950	150,697	134,942	90	15,042	10	343	0.2	321	0.2	49	0.03				
1960	179,323	158,832	89	18,872	11	552	0.3	980	1	88	0.05				
1970	203,212	177,749	87	22,580	11	827	0.4	1,539	1	517	0.3				
1980	226,546	188,372	83	26,495	12	1,420	1	3,500	2	6,758	3	14,609	6	180,256	80
1990	248,710	199,686	80	29,986	12	1,959	1	7,274	3	9,805	4	22,354	9	188,128	76
2000	281,422	211,461	75	34,658	12	2,476	1	10,642	4	22,185	8	35,306	13	194,553	69
2010	308,746	223,553	72	38,929	13	2,932	1	15,214	5	28,116	9	50,478	16	196,818	64

Total population in thousands, % indicates percentage of total population

^a American Indian include Eskimo and Aleut

^b Hispanic origin of any race

Source: Campbell and Jung (2002) and US Census Bureau (2010)